

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/965,122	09/28/2001	Masataka Tamura	016910-0475	1777
75	90 10/15/2002			
Richard L. Schwaab			EXAMINER	
FOLEY & LARDNER Washington Harbour 3000 K Street N.W., Suite 500			JOHNSON, JONATHAN J	
Washington, DC	shington, DC 20007-5109	•	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1725	
			DATE MAILED: 10/15/2002	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

TO-326 (Rev		Office Action Summary	Part of Paper No. 8	
2) Notice	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (P nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Po	TO-948) 5) 🗌 Not	erview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) ice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) er:	
Attachment	• •	🗖		
	cknowledgment is made of a claim f	or domestic priority under 35 U	.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.	
а)	☐ The translation of the foreign lar	guage provisional application l	nas been received.	
14) 🗌 A	cknowledgment is made of a claim for	or domestic priority under 35 U	S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application)).
		ational Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2	(a)).	
			been received in this National Stage	
	2. Certified copies of the priority			
•	1.⊠ Certified copies of the priority	documents have been received	d.	
- -	☑ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:	<u> </u>	2 ., , , , ,	
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim	for foreign priority under 35 U.	S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).	
Pri rity u	nder 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120			
12) 🔲 🏾	The oath or declaration is objected to	by the Examiner.		
	If approved, corrected drawings are re-			
11) 🔲 🏾	The proposed drawing correction file	= : :	• • •	
,	Applicant may not request that any obj	. , , . ,	•	
•	The drawing(s) filed on 13 June 2002		pjected to by the Examiner.	
	The specification is objected to by the	e Examiner.		
•	on Papers	on analor olooligh roquironlent	•	
	Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> are subject to restriction	on and/or election requirement		
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Claim(s) <u>15</u> is/are objected to.			
	Claim(s) <u>13,14 and 16-19</u> is/are reje	cted.		
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.	<u></u>	· · ·	
•	4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>1-12 and 2</u>		eration	
· <u> </u>	Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the	application		
,—	closed in accordance with the prac on of Claims			
3)□	Since this application is in condition	n for allowance except for form	al matters, prosecution as to the merits is	
2a) <u></u>		2b)⊠ This action is non-final		
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) fi	ed on <u>9-11-02</u> .		
THE N - Exter after - If the - If NO - Failui - Any r	MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUN nsions of time may be available under the provisions SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this common period for reply specified above is less than thirty (3)	CATION. of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, nunication. 0) days, a reply within the statutory minimur atutory period will apply and will expire SIX will, by statute, cause the application to bed	may a reply be timely filed n of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. come ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD F	OR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIR	E 3 MONTH(S) FROM	
Period fo		icati n appears on the cover sh	eet with the correspondence address	
		Jonathan Johnson	1725	
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
		09/965,122	TAMURA ET AL.	
		Application No.	Applicant(s)	

Application/Control Number: 09/965,122

Art Unit: 1725

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election of Group II, Claims 13-19 in Paper No. 7 is acknowledged.

Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (e) the invention was described in-
- (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effect under this subsection of a national application published under section 122(b) only if the international application designating the United States was published under Article 21(2)(a) of such treaty in the English language; or
- (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that a patent shall not be deemed filed in the United States for the purposes of this subsection based on the filing of an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a).

Claims 13-14, 16-17, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Jones (6,060,686). Jones teaches irradiating a condensed laser beam generated by a laser source to a certain point of an underwater workpiece (Figure 2, item 18b and 12a); supplying gas to the certain point from a nozzle having a gas exit (Figure 2, Item 22a); the nozzle having an area

Application/Control Number: 09/965,122 Page 3

Art Unit: 1725

surround the gas exit that extends to the surface of the workpiece for keeping the supplied gas between the nozzle and the workpiece (Column 3, Lines 25-40).

With respect to Claim 14, the teachings of Jones are the same as relied upon in the rejection of Claim 13. Jones teaches a nozzle is formed as a disk having a gas exit at the center thereof (Figure 2, item 20c and Column 3, Lines 25-40).

With respect to Claim 16, the teachings of Jones are the same as relied upon in the rejection of Claim 13. Jones teaches a welding wire supplied to a certain point (Column 4, Lines 50-65).

With respect to Claim 17, the teachings of Jones are the same as relied upon in the rejection of Claim 13. Jones teaches irradiating the workpiece at an angle to the workpiece (Figure 1, item 18b).

With respect to Claim 19, the teachings of Jones are the same as relied upon in the rejection of Claim 13. Jones teaches adjusting a gap between the nozzle and the workpiece (Column 3, Lines 45-55).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Application/Control Number: 09/965,122

Art Unit: 1725

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jones as applied to Claim 13 above, and further in view of Cruickshank et al. (3,632,955). Cruickshank et al. teach separating visible light by a dichroic mirror and inputting the separated visible light into an image sensor (Figure 10, items 66 and 67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the laser of Jones to utilize the mirror and sensor in order to view the welding with complete operator safety (see Cruickshank et al. Column 5, Lines 30-60).

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 15 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance: The prior art of record does not suggest or teach an underwater laser processing method, particularly where the nozzle has a circular groove on the surface facing the workpiece.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Application/Control Number: 09/965,122

Art Unit: 1725

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jonathan Johnson whose telephone number is 703-308-0667. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 7AM-5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tom Dunn can be reached on 703-308-3318. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9310 for regular communications and 703-872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0661.

September 28, 2002

M. ALEXANDRA ELVE PRIMARY EXAMINER

Page 5